

Rearrangements of the Haar system which preserve BMO

by

Paul F.X. Müller*

* Supported by the Austrian Academy of Sciences, APART Programm

1991 Mathematics Subject

Classification: 42C20, 43A17, 47B38

Key words and phrases: Haar system, rearrangements, Carleson measures, BMO

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the collection of dyadic intervals in $[0, 1]$. Let τ be a rearrangement of the dyadic intervals; i.e., $\tau : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an injective map. In this paper we study the induced operator given by the relation

$$Th_I = h_{\tau(I)},$$

where h_I is the L^∞ -normalized Haar function.

A function x on $[0, 1]$ with Haar expansion $\sum x_I h_I$, is in dyadic BMO if

$$\|x\| = \sup_{J \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I \subseteq J} x_I^2 |I| \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

$\|T\|$ is the operator norm of T on BMO. We give the following geometric characterization of those rearrangements τ for which $\|T\| \|T^{-1}\| < \infty$ respectively $\|T\| < \infty$: τ and τ^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$ whenever T is an isomorphism on BMO; τ satisfies the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$ whenever T is a bounded operator, (see Section 2 for definitions). We will also see that T is bounded whenever τ preserves the Carleson packing condition. (We say that $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{D}$ satisfies the M Carleson condition if,

$$(1.1) \quad \sup_{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}, I \subseteq J} |I| \leq M.$$

$\llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket$ denotes the infimum of the constants M that satisfy (1.1).)

The following two theorems summarize the results of this paper:

Theorem 1 *For a rearrangement τ the following are equivalent.*

(i) $T : \text{BMO} \rightarrow \text{BMO}$ is an isomorphism.

- (ii) *There exists $M \geq 0$ so that for any $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{D}$,*
 $M^{-1} \llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket \leq \llbracket \tau(\mathcal{L}) \rrbracket \leq M \llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket$.
- (iii) *τ and τ^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$.*

Theorem 2 *For a rearrangement τ the following are equivalent.*

- (i) *$T : \text{BMO} \rightarrow \text{BMO}$ is a bounded operator.*
- (ii) *There exists $M \geq 1$ so that for $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{D}$, $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{L}) \rrbracket \leq M \llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket$.*
- (iii) *τ satisfies the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$.*

We should emphasise the fact that the theorems above concern rearrangements of the L^∞ normalized Haar system. For, had we considered rearrangements of the L^2 normalized Haar system in BMO , then the difficulties of the above problems would have disappeared almost entirely.

The first significant results about the behaviour of the Haar system under rearrangements were due to E.M. Semyonov, see [S1]-[S3]. Under the a-priori assumption that $|\tau(I)| = |I|$ for $I \in \mathcal{D}$ E.M. Semyonov found a necessary and sufficient condition for the boundedness of the induced permutation operator acting from L^p into L^q . The present work is partly motivated by the desire to eliminate any a-priori assumptions from Semyonov's theorems.

A further motivation for studying arbitrary rearrangements of the Haar system is provided by the result in [J3]. There Peter Jones has given a geometric description of homeomorphisms of the real line which preserve BMO .

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Peter Jones for extremely helpful suggestions and discussions during the preparation of this paper.

2 The geometric conditions on τ

We are now going to define Property $\mathcal{P}$ and the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$. These definitions are difficult to unwind. We will therefore look at a simplified version of Property $\mathcal{P}$ at the end of this section.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a collection of dyadic intervals. Following standard notation we let $\mathcal{L} \cap J = \{I \in \mathcal{L} : I \subseteq J\}$. $\mathcal{L}^*$ denotes the set covered by $\mathcal{L}$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}^* = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{L}} I$. $\max \mathcal{L}$ denotes those $K \in \mathcal{L}$ that are maximal with respect to inclusion. $\max \mathcal{L}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals which covers the same set as $\mathcal{L}$. We say that a rearrangement τ satisfies *Property $\mathcal{P}$* if there exists $M > 0$ so that for each $J \in \mathcal{D}$ the collection $\tau(\mathcal{D}) \cap J$ can be decomposed as a disjoint union

$$\bigcup \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$$

so that

$$(2.1) \quad \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i \text{ satisfies the } M \text{ Carleson condition,}$$

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|},$$

whenever $I \in \mathcal{L}_i$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| \leq M|J|.$$

The essential, and most difficult, implication of Theorem 1 is that $\|T\| \|T^{-1}\| < \infty$ causes τ and τ^{-1} to satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$. Later, we will describe examples of rearrangements which show that we have to weaken Property $\mathcal{P}$ to find a characterization for the case $\|T\| < \infty$. We say that a

rearrangement τ satisfies the *weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$* if there exists $M > 0$ so that for every $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}$ and $J \in \mathcal{D}$, the collection $\tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J$ can be decomposed as a disjoint union

$$\bigcup \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i,$$

so that

$$(2.4) \quad \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i \text{ satisfies the } M\text{-Carleson condition,}$$

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|},$$

whenever $I \in \mathcal{L}_i$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| \leq M|J| \sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i)) \rrbracket.$$

The weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$ allows for a nice decomposition of $\tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J$ *only* when $\sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i)) \rrbracket$ is bounded. Hence the above condition on τ is weaker than Property $\mathcal{P}$.

It might be useful to make a few straightforward observations: For $x = \sum x_I h_I$ we have

$$(2.7) \quad \sup |x_I| \leq \|x\|$$

and for $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$,

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} x_I^2 |I| \leq \|x\|^2 |\mathcal{L}^*|.$$

Let now $x = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} h_I$, then $\|x\| = \llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket^{1/2}$ and by (2.8),

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} |I| \leq \llbracket \mathcal{L} \rrbracket |\mathcal{L}^*|.$$

We use the rest of this section to discuss why $\mathcal{P}$ and weak $\mathcal{P}$ appear *naturally* when boundedness of permutation operators is studied in BMO. Suppose first, that for a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of dyadic intervals we have $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{C}) \rrbracket \leq M$. Then, in BMO, $\{h_{\tau(I)} : I \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is $M^{1/2}$ equivalent to the unit vectors in ℓ^∞ . Indeed for $x_I \in \mathbb{R}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I h_{\tau(I)} \right\|^2 &= \sup_J \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J, I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I^2 |\tau(I)| \\ &\leq \sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I^2 \sup_J \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J, I \in \mathcal{C}} |\tau(I)| \\ &\leq \sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I^2 M. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (2.7),

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |x_I| \leq \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I h_{\tau(I)} \right\| \leq M^{1/2} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |x_I|.$$

This shows that $\{h_{\tau(I)} : I \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is equivalent to the unit vector basis in ℓ^∞ . By (2.7) again,

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |x_I| \leq \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I h_I \right\|.$$

Therefore in the case where $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{C}) \rrbracket \leq M$, the rearrangement τ does not need to satisfy any further conditions for T to be bounded on $\text{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

If however $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{L}) \rrbracket = \infty$ for some collection $\mathcal{L}$ then we should expect that a strong homogeneity condition – to be satisfied by τ on $\mathcal{L}$ – is necessary for T to be bounded on $\text{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{L}\}$. The following condition, which is a simplified model of Property $\mathcal{P}$, specifies which homogeneity condition we have in mind.

A rearrangement τ is said to satisfy condition $\mathcal{S}$, if for every $J \in \mathcal{D}$, $\tau(\mathcal{D}) \cap J$ splits into $\tau(\mathcal{L}) \cup \mathcal{E}$ so that

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{E} \text{ satisfies the } M\text{-Carleson condition,}$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L})^*|}{|\mathcal{L}^*|}, \text{ for } I \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Condition $\mathcal{S}$ is a useful model for Property $\mathcal{P}$. However, $\mathcal{S}$ cannot replace $\mathcal{P}$ in Theorem 1 since $\mathcal{S}$ is not a necessary condition for T to be an isomorphism on BMO . (See Section 5.) However condition $\mathcal{S}$ is a sufficient condition for T to be bounded. We bring the short proof of this statement now because it illustrates our approach to the problems addressed in this paper.

Let $x = \sum x_I h_I$. Choose $J \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|Tx\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J} x_I^2 |\tau(I)|.$$

By condition $\mathcal{S}$ we may split $\{\tau(I) \subseteq J\}$ as $\tau(\mathcal{L}) \cup \mathcal{E}$ so that (2.10) and (2.11) hold. Write

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} x_I^2 |\tau(I)| \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\tau(I) \in \mathcal{E}} x_I^2 |\tau(I)|. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.11), $|\tau(I)| \leq M |\tau(\mathcal{L})^*| |I| / |\mathcal{L}^*|$ whenever $I \in \mathcal{L}$ and so since $\tau(\mathcal{L})^* \subseteq J$ and (2.8) we may estimate

$$(2.13) \quad S_1 \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L})^*|}{|\mathcal{L}^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} x_I^2 |I|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq M \frac{|J|}{|\mathcal{L}^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} x_I^2 |I| \\
&\leq M |J| \|x\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.7), (2.9) and (2.10) that

$$(2.14) \quad S_2 \leq \sup_I x_I^2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}} |I| \leq \|x\|^2 |J| \|\mathcal{E}\| \leq \|x\|^2 |J| M.$$

By (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14), T is bounded on BMO .

3 Rearrangements inducing Isomorphisms of BMO

In this section we prove the Main Lemma of this paper. It allows us to find a block of intervals on which τ acts homogeneously; this block will be chosen as large as possible. We then show that the remaining intervals are comparatively few when $\|T\| < \infty$. Successively applying the Main Lemma we deduce Property $\mathcal{P}$ when $\|T\| \|T^{-1}\| < \infty$.

For $J \in \mathcal{D}$ we let $Q(J) = \{I \in \mathcal{D}, I \subseteq J\}$; for $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ we let $Q(\mathcal{L}) = \{J \in \mathcal{D} : \exists K \in \mathcal{L}, J \subseteq K\}$.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that $\|\tau(\mathcal{E})\| \leq M$ when $\mathcal{E}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals. Then, for $A \geq 1$ and $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ there exists $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{D}$, consisting of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals so that:*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{L \in \mathcal{C}} |L| \leq \frac{M |I_0|}{A}.$$

(ii) If $\mathcal{L} = Q(I_0) \setminus Q(\mathcal{C})$ then for $I \in \mathcal{L}$

$$\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L})^*| + |\tau(\mathcal{C})^*|}{|I_0|}.$$

PROOF. We will first construct an auxiliary collection $\mathcal{K}$ of coloured dyadic intervals. In each step of the construction we modify $\mathcal{K}$ by changing the colour of a particular $I \in \mathcal{K}$, or by adding a new interval to $\mathcal{K}$. We write $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K} \cup \{L\}$ when we decide to put L into the already existing collection $\mathcal{K}$.

We shall now define two construction rules and a stopping rule. Following these rules we will then construct $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Let $A \geq 1$ and pick $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$.

Rule 1: Suppose there exists a green interval $I \in \mathcal{K}$ such that at least one of the two dyadic subintervals of I with length $|I|/2$ is not contained in $\mathcal{K}$. Call it I_1 .

If

$$\frac{|\tau(I_1)|}{|I_1|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K} \cup \{I_1\})^*|}{|I_0|},$$

then I_1 is a green interval and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K} \cup \{I_1\}$.

If

$$\frac{|\tau(I_1)|}{|I_1|} > A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K} \cup \{I_1\})^*|}{|I_0|},$$

then I_1 is a red interval and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K} \cup \{I_1\}$.

Rule 2: Suppose $I \in \mathcal{K}$ is a red interval.

If

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*|}{|I_0|}.$$

Then we change the colour of I from red to green. If (3.1) does not hold, then we don't change the colour of I .

Rule 3: Suppose that for each red interval $I \in \mathcal{K}$ we have

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} > A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*|}{|I_0|},$$

then we define $\mathcal{C}$ to be the collection of red intervals in $\mathcal{K}$.

Next we decree how these rules are to be applied.

The proof starts as follows. I_0 is a green interval and $\mathcal{K} := \{I_0\}$. Then we apply Rule 1 until for every green interval I , both dyadic subintervals of measure $|I|/2$, are contained in $\mathcal{K}$. We then apply Rule 2 to the red intervals of $\mathcal{K}$.

If a new green interval is created by applying Rule 2, then we apply Rule 1, as above, and thereafter Rule 2 again, etc.

If we don't create new green intervals by applying Rule 2 to the red intervals of $\mathcal{K}$, then the stopping criterion (3.2) of Rule 3 holds and we define $\mathcal{C}$ to be the red intervals in $\mathcal{K}$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cap I_0$ be the collections constructed by applying our three rules as described above. During the construction, each interval in $\mathcal{K}$ has been coloured. Note that only subintervals of green intervals can be placed into $\mathcal{K}$ by Rule 1. Hence, if $I \in \mathcal{K}$ is red and K is strictly contained in I , then $K \notin \mathcal{K}$. Therefore any two red intervals $L, K \in \mathcal{K}$ are necessarily disjoint. Hence, $\mathcal{C}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint intervals. By hypothesis on τ the collection $\tau(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies the M Carleson condition. In particular, since $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \supseteq \tau(\mathcal{C})$,

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |\tau(I)| \leq \frac{1}{|\tau(\mathcal{C})^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |\tau(I)| \leq M.$$

On the other hand, summing the inequalities (3.2) gives

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{1}{|I_0|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |I| \leq \frac{1}{A|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |\tau(I)|.$$

Combining (3.3) and (3.4) gives

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} |I| \leq \frac{M|I_0|}{A}.$$

This is Lemma 1, (i).

We now turn to (ii). Recall that $K \notin \mathcal{K}$ when K is strictly contained in $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Recall also that $I_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ and if $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $I_0 \supseteq L \supseteq K$ then $L \in \mathcal{K}$. If we let $\mathcal{L} = Q(I_0) \setminus Q(\mathcal{C})$ then $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{C}$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}$ consists of the green intervals of $\mathcal{K}$. Recall that $I \in \mathcal{K}$ is green when

$$\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*|}{|I_0|}.$$

Clearly, $|\tau(\mathcal{K})^*| \leq |\tau(\mathcal{L})^*| + |\tau(\mathcal{C})^*|$. Therefore,

$$\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L})^*| + |\tau(\mathcal{C})^*|}{|I_0|}$$

whenever $I \in \mathcal{L}$. This proves Lemma 1 (ii). ■

REMARK. The same proof shows that for any $A \geq 1$, $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}$ there exists $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$, consisting of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals, so that

$$(i) \quad \sum_{L \in \mathcal{C}} |L| \leq \frac{M|J|}{A}.$$

(ii) If $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{B} \cap I_0 \setminus Q(\mathcal{C})$, then

$$\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq A \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L})^*| + |\tau(\mathcal{C})^*|}{|I_0|}.$$

We will obtain Property $\mathcal{P}$ by combining the local information obtained in Lemma 1. The next lemma is a useful tool for achieving this.

Lemma 2 *Let $\mathcal{G}_k, k \in \mathbf{N}$ be collections of pairwise disjoint intervals satisfying the following conditions.*

$$(3.5) \quad \text{If } I \in \mathcal{G}_k, K \in \mathcal{G}_m \text{ and } I \cap K \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } I \supset K \text{ iff } k < m.$$

$$(3.6) \quad \text{For } I \in \mathcal{G}_k \text{ and } l \geq 1, \sum_{K \in \mathcal{G}_{k+l} \cap I} |K| \leq 2^{-l} |I|.$$

Let $\mathcal{V}_k$ be a collection of dyadic intervals in $Q(\mathcal{G}_k) \setminus Q(\mathcal{G}_{k+1})$. Then

$$\left[\left[\bigcup \mathcal{V}_k \right] \right] \leq 2 \sup \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket.$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup \mathcal{V}_k$. Let $I \in \mathcal{D}$. There is $k_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $I \in Q(\mathcal{G}_{k_0}) \setminus Q(\mathcal{G}_{k_0+1})$. By (3.5), we may rewrite $\mathcal{V} \cap I$ as follows:

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{V} \cap I = \bigcup_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}_k \cap I.$$

Since $\mathcal{V}_k \cap I^*$ is contained in $\mathcal{G}_k \cap I^*$, by (2.9), we obtain

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{V}_k \cap I} |K| \leq \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket |\mathcal{G}_k \cap I^*|.$$

By (3.6) – (3.8), $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the $2 \sup \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket$ Carleson condition. For

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{V} \cap I} |K| &= \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{V}_k \cap I} |K| \\ &= \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket |\mathcal{G}_k \cap I^*| \\ &\leq \sup \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket 2|I|. \end{aligned}$$

■

Proposition 1 *Suppose there exists $M \geq 1$ such that $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}) \rrbracket \leq M \llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket$ for $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Then, for $J \in \mathcal{D}$, the collection $\tau(\mathcal{D}) \cap J$ can be decomposed as*

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_i,$$

so that the following conditions hold.

(i) $\bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$ satisfies the $2M$ Carleson condition.

(ii) When $I \in \mathcal{L}_i$, then

$$\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq 2M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|}.$$

(iii)
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| \leq |J| 2M \sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i)) \rrbracket.$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{G}_0$ be the maximal intervals of $\tau^{-1}\{Q(J)\}$. Given $I \in \mathcal{G}_0$, let $\mathcal{C}_I$ resp. $\mathcal{L}_I$ satisfy the conclusion (i) resp. (ii) of Lemma 1. We let $\mathcal{B}_I$ be the collection of dyadic intervals K for which $\tilde{K}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_I$. Here $\tilde{K}$ denotes the dyadic interval satisfying $\tilde{K} \supset K$ and $|\tilde{K}| = 2|K|$. Note that $\mathcal{B}_I$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals. Hence $\mathcal{G}_1 = \bigcup_I \mathcal{B}_I$, where I ranges over $\mathcal{G}_0$, is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals.

We choose now $K \in \mathcal{G}_1$, and we let $\mathcal{C}_K$, resp. $\mathcal{L}_K$, satisfy the conclusions (i), resp. (ii), of Lemma 1. The collection $\mathcal{B}_K$ is obtained from $\mathcal{C}_K$ by the procedure as described for the first step. Then $\mathcal{G}_2 = \bigcup_K \mathcal{B}_K$, where K ranges over $\mathcal{G}_1$, is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals. Continuing inductively we obtain a decomposition of $\tau^{-1}\{Q(J)\}$ as

$$\bigcup \mathcal{L}_I \cup \bigcup \mathcal{C}_I$$

where I ranges over $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_k$. Note that $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{B}_I$ equals $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_k$.

We shall now verify that $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies the 2 Carleson condition. Recall that $\mathcal{G}_k$ is a collection of disjoint intervals and $\mathcal{G}_{k+1} = \bigcup \mathcal{B}_I$ where I ranges over $\mathcal{G}_k$. Hence, for $I \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $K \in \mathcal{G}_m$ with $I \cap K \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$(3.9) \quad I \supset K \text{ iff } k < m.$$

Note that by Lemma 1 (i), for $I \in \mathcal{G}_k$,

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1} \cap I} |K| \leq \frac{|I|}{2}.$$

Hence, by induction, for $I \in \mathcal{G}_k$,

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{G}_{k+l} \cap I} |K| \leq \frac{|I|}{2^l}.$$

By (3.9) and (3.10), Lemma 2 gives $[\![\mathcal{G}]\!] \leq 2$. We enumerate $\{\mathcal{C}_I, I \in \mathcal{G}\}$ as $\{\mathcal{C}_i : i \in \mathbf{N}\}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_i = \tau(\mathcal{C}_i)$. By hypothesis, τ preserves the Carleson condition. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\bigcup \mathcal{E}_i]\!] &= [\![\tau(\bigcup \mathcal{C}_i)]\!] \\ &\leq M[\![\bigcup \mathcal{C}_i]\!] \\ &\leq M[\![\mathcal{G}]\!] \\ &\leq M2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (i).

We enumerate $\{\mathcal{L}_I : I \in \mathcal{G}\}$ as $\{\mathcal{L}_i : i \in \mathbf{N}\}$ in the same manner. Thus Lemma 1 (ii) gives (ii). We now show (iii). Recall that $\mathcal{L}_I = Q(I) \setminus Q(\mathcal{C}_I)$. Hence

$$(3.11) \quad \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}_k} \mathcal{L}_I = Q(\mathcal{G}_k) \setminus Q(\mathcal{G}_{k+1}).$$

Recall also that $\mathcal{L}_I^* \cap \mathcal{L}_K^* = \emptyset$, when $I, K \in \mathcal{G}_k$ and clearly $\tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_I$. Now let $\mathcal{V}_k = \bigcup \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I))$, where the union is taken over $I \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Then, by (3.9) – (3.11), Lemma 2 gives $\llbracket \bigcup \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket \leq 2 \max \llbracket \mathcal{V}_k \rrbracket$, and so

$$\left\llbracket \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I)) \right\rrbracket \leq 2 \sup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} \llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I)) \rrbracket.$$

Relabelling $\{\mathcal{L}_I\}$ as $\{\mathcal{L}_i\}$ gives (iii) for

$$\begin{aligned} (3.12) \quad & \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_i |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| \leq \llbracket \bigcup \max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \rrbracket \\ & \leq M \llbracket \bigcup \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i)) \rrbracket \\ & \leq 2M \sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_i)) \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

■

REMARKS. 1) Suppose, moreover, that τ^{-1} preserves the Carleson condition, i.e., there exists $M \geq 1$ such that $\llbracket \tau^{-1} \mathcal{E} \rrbracket \leq M \llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket$ for $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Since $\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I)$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint intervals we have $\llbracket \tau^{-1}(\max \tau(\mathcal{L}_I)) \rrbracket \leq M$. Hence (3.12) gives the estimate

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| \leq 2M^2.$$

2) The proof of Proposition 1 shows that if τ preserves the Carleson condition, then for any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, the collection $\tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J$ can be decomposed as $\bigcup \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$ with $\mathcal{L}_i \subset \mathcal{B}$ and so that the conclusions (i) – (iii) of Proposition 1 hold.

3) Fix $J \in \mathcal{D}$ and suppose that τ preserves the Carleson condition. Let $\mathcal{L}_i$, $\mathcal{C}_i$ and $\mathcal{E}_i = \tau(\mathcal{C}_i)$ be the collections of intervals constructed in the proof of

Proposition 1. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_i^* \subseteq \mathcal{L}_i^*$. Now let $\mathcal{K}_i = \mathcal{L}_i \cup \mathcal{C}_i$, $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$. Then by Proposition 1, we have

$$(i) \quad \tau(\mathcal{D}) \cap J = \bigcup \tau(\mathcal{K}_i),$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathcal{E} \text{ satisfies the } M \text{ Carleson condition,}$$

$$(iii) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K}_i)^*|}{|\mathcal{K}_i^*|},$$

whenever $I \in \mathcal{K}_i$ and $\tau(I) \notin \mathcal{E}$,

$$(iv) \quad \sum |\tau(\mathcal{K}_i)^*| \leq |J| M \sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1} \max \tau(\mathcal{K}_i) \rrbracket.$$

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1, which has the following pattern:

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau \text{ and } \tau^{-1} \text{ preserve the Carleson condition;} \\ \Rightarrow & \tau \text{ satisfies Property } \mathcal{P}; \\ \Rightarrow & T \text{ is bounded;} \\ \Rightarrow & \tau \text{ preserves the Carleson condition.} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the hypothesis of the first line is symmetric in τ and τ^{-1} . Hence, the above statemets hold with τ replaced by τ^{-1} , respectively T replaced by T^{-1} . The first implication is the most difficult part of Theorem 1. It follows from the assertions of Proposition 1. Below we prove the implication from line 2 to line 3.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): When $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and $x = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}} h_I$, then $Tx = \sum_{J \in \tau(\mathcal{E})} h_J$. By (2.9), $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}) \rrbracket = \|Tx\|^2$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket = \|x\|^2$. Thus (ii) holds with $M = \|T\|^2$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): This part of the proof follows from Proposition 1 and Remark 1.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): We show that $\|T\| < \infty$ when τ satisfies Property $\mathcal{P}$. Let $x = \sum x_I h_I$. Then $Tx = \sum x_I h_{\tau(I)}$. For $J \in \mathcal{D}$ we will prove that

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J} x_I^2 |\tau(I)| \leq 3M^2 |J| \|x\|^2.$$

Assuming τ satisfies Property $\mathcal{P}$, we decompose $\tau(\mathcal{D}) \cap J$ as

$$\bigcup \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$$

so that (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) hold. We let $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_i \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}_i} x_I^2 |\tau(I)|, \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\tau(I) \in \mathcal{E}} x_I^2 |\tau(I)|. \end{aligned}$$

First, we prove the estimate $S_1 \leq 2M^2 \|x\|^2 |J|$. Note that, by (2.2),

$$|\tau(I)| \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|} |I|$$

when $I \in \mathcal{L}_i$. By (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}_i} x_I^2 |\tau(I)| &\leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}_i} x_I^2 |I| \\ &\leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|} |\mathcal{L}_i^*| \|x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (2.1) and (2.3),

$$(3.14) \quad S_1 \leq M \|x\|^2 \sum_i |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i^*)| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|$$

$$\leq M||x||^2(M + \llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket)|J|$$

$$\leq 2M^2||x||^2|J|.$$

Using (2.3) and (2.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} (3.15) \quad S_2 &\leq \sup x_I^2 \sum_{\tau(I) \in \mathcal{E}} |\tau(I)| \\ &\leq M||x||^2|J|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.14) and (3.15) gives (3.13). ■

REMARK. Theorem 1 admits a partial extension to the case of L^p spaces. There, one considers rearrangements of the L^p normalized Haar system. If τ and τ^{-1} satisfy the Property $\mathcal{P}$ then,

$$(3.16) \quad J_1 : h_I \mapsto h_{\tau(I)}$$

extends to an isomorphism on BMO , and by $H^1 - \text{BMO}$ duality, the operator

$$(3.17) \quad J_0 : \frac{h_I}{|I|} \mapsto \frac{h_{\tau(I)}}{|\tau(I)|}$$

extends to an isomorphism on dyadic H^1 .

Rearrangements of the L^p normalized Haarsystem are given by the operator

$$J_{1-1/p} : \frac{h_I}{|I|^{1/p}} \mapsto \frac{h_{\tau(I)}}{|\tau(I)|^{1/p}}$$

where $1 < p < \infty$. The operator $J_{1-1/p}$ coincides with the operator

$$h_I \mapsto h_{\tau(I)} \left(\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \right)^{-1/p}.$$

Hence the family of operators $\{J_t : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ is embedded in the *analytic* family of operators

$$J_z : h_I \mapsto h_{\tau(I)} \left(\frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \right)^{z-1}$$

where $z \in S = \{x + iy : 0 \leq x \leq 1, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

From (3.16) and (3.17) it follows that $\|J_{iy}\|_{H^1} \leq M$ and $\|J_{1+iy}\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq M$ where M is independent of $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly

$$z \mapsto e^{-|y|} \log \left| \int T_z f g \right|$$

is uniformly bounded on S , whenever f and g are finite linear combinations of Haar functions. Hence by complex interpolation (see [F-St]), $\|J_{1-1/p}\|_{L^p} \leq M$, as claimed. We thus have shown that if τ and τ^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$, then permuting the L^p -normalized Haar system by τ leads to an isomorphism on L^p .

4 Rearrangements inducing bounded Operators on BMO

In this section we characterize rearrangements for which $\|T\| < \infty$; we show that $\|T\| < \infty$ holds iff τ satisfies the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$. The pattern of the proof for Theorem 2 differs from that of Theorem 1. It is as follows:

- T is bounded;
- $\Rightarrow \tau$ preserves the Carleson condition;
- $\Rightarrow \tau$ satisfies the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$;
- $\Rightarrow \tau$ preserves the Carleson condition;
- $\Rightarrow T$ is bounded.

The proof of Proposition 1 gives the implication from line 2 to line 3. For the implication from line 4 to line 5 we rephrase an argument of P. Jones [J1, Lemma 2.1] in terms of dyadic intervals. It enters the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 2 *For a rearrangement τ the following are equivalent.*

- (i) $T : \text{BMO} \rightarrow \text{BMO}$ is bounded.
- (ii) There exists $M \geq 1$ such that $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}) \rrbracket \leq M \llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket$ for any collection $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{D}$.
- (iii) There exists $M \geq 1$ such that $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}) \rrbracket \leq M$ for any collection $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{D}$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{E} \rrbracket \leq 4$.

PROOF. The only implication that requires proof is (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Let $x = \sum x_I h_I$ have norm ≤ 1 . Using (iii) we prove that $\|Tx\| \leq M^{1/2}$. We may assume that there exists $K \in \mathbf{N}$ and $k_I \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad x_I^2 = k_I K^{-1} \text{ for } I \in \mathcal{D}.$$

As $x_I^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \leq 1$, we have $k_I \leq K$.

We will define collections of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_K$ so that $\mathcal{E}_i$ satisfies the 3 Carleson condition, the set covered by $\tau(\mathcal{E}_i)$ is contained in J and

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{K} \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J} k_I |\tau(I)| = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}_i} |\tau(I)|.$$

Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Let v_n be the vector whose entries are dyadic intervals I of length 2^{-n} such that $\tau(I) \subseteq J$. Each such I appears with multiplicity k_I .

Fix $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and suppose that $|I| = 2^{-n}$. We say that I is in $\mathcal{E}_i$ iff I occupies the p -th position in v_n and $p = i \bmod K$.

Note that since $k_I \leq K$ the entries of the vectors v_n are bijectively distributed among the collections $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_K$ by the above rule. This gives the identity (4.2). We show next that each of the $\mathcal{E}_i$ satisfies the 3 Carleson condition. Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. We take another look at the definition of $\mathcal{E}_i$ and see that the cardinality $A_{n,i}$ of the collection $\{I \subseteq I_0 : I \in \mathcal{E}_i, |I| = 2^{-n}\}$ is bounded by

$$(4.3) \quad 1 + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{I \subseteq I_0, |I|=2^{-n}} k_I.$$

By (4.3), (4.1) and $\|x\| \leq 1$ we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}_i \cap I_0} |I| &= \sum_{n=-\log_2 |I_0|}^{\infty} 2^{-n} A_{n,i} \\ &\leq 2|I_0| + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{I \subseteq I_0} k_I |I| \\ &\leq 3|I_0|. \end{aligned}$$

This gives $\|\mathcal{E}_i\| \leq 3$. Using identity (4.2) we now show that $\|Tx\| \leq M^{1/2}$.

Recall that the interval J was chosen so that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|Tx\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J} x_I^2 |\tau(I)|.$$

By (4.1) and (4.2),

$$(4.4) \quad \sum_{\tau(I) \subseteq J} x_I^2 |\tau(I)| = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}_i} |\tau(I)|.$$

For $i \leq K$, by (2.9),

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{E}_i} |\tau(I)| \leq \llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}_i) \rrbracket |\tau(\mathcal{E}_i)^*|.$$

Hence, since $\llbracket \tau(\mathcal{E}_i) \rrbracket \leq M$ and $|\tau(\mathcal{E}_i)^*| \leq |J|$, (4.4) is $\leq M|J|$. This proves (i) when (iii) holds.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.

(ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (i): See Proposition 2.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): See Proposition 1 and the Remarks thereafter.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and $J \in \mathcal{D}$. Assuming that (iii) holds, i.e., assuming that τ satisfies the weak Property $\mathcal{P}$ we will first show that

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{\tau(I) \in \tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J} |\tau(I)| \leq 3M|J|\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket^2.$$

By (iii) we may decompose $\tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J$ as $\bigcup \tau(\mathcal{L}_i) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$ in such a way that (2.4)-(2.6) hold. Let $S_1 = \sum_i \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}_i} |\tau(I)|$ and $S_2 = \sum_i \sum_{K \in \mathcal{E}_i} |K|$. Since $\mathcal{L}_i \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, by (2.5), (2.9) and (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq \sum_i \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*|}{|\mathcal{L}_i^*|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}_i} |I| \\ &\leq \llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket \sum_i |\tau(\mathcal{L}_i)^*| + |\mathcal{E}_i^*| \\ &\leq \llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket (\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket M + M)|J|. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.4) we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq \left[\left[\bigcup \mathcal{E}_i \right] \right] |J| \\ &\leq M|J|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket \geq 1$ whenever $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$. Combining the estimates for S_1, S_2 gives $S_1 + S_2 \leq 3M\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket^2|J|$. This demonstrates (4.5). Hence

$$(4.6) \quad \llbracket \tau(\mathcal{B}) \rrbracket \leq 3M\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket^2.$$

It remains to replace $\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket^2$ by $C\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket$ in (4.6). Let $A \in \mathbf{N}$ be the largest integer which is less than $4\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket$. By [J2, Lemma 5.1], $\mathcal{B}$ can be decomposed as $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_A$ in such a way that $\llbracket \mathcal{B}_i \rrbracket \leq 4$, $i \leq A$. Applying (4.6) to $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_A$, this decomposition gives

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \tau(\mathcal{B}) \rrbracket &\leq \sum_{i=1}^A \llbracket \tau(\mathcal{B}_i) \rrbracket \\ &\leq 48M\llbracket \mathcal{B} \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus proved (ii). ■

REMARKS. 1) By Theorem 2 it is clear that T is an isomorphism on BMO iff τ and τ^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$. However, the proof of Theorem 1 given above uses only Proposition 1 and does not depend on Proposition 2.

2) It follows from the remarks after Proposition 1 that the boundedness of T on BMO can also be characterized by the following condition on τ :

There exists $M \geq 1$ so that for $J \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}$, there exists a sequence $\{\mathcal{K}_i\}$ of pairwise disjoint collections of intervals, and a collection $\mathcal{E}$ of intervals so that

$$(i) \quad \tau(\mathcal{B}) \cap J = \bigcup \tau(\mathcal{K}_i);$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathcal{E} \text{ satisfies the } M \text{ Carleson condition};$$

$$(iii) \quad \frac{|\tau(I)|}{|I|} \leq M \frac{|\tau(\mathcal{K}_i)^*|}{|\mathcal{K}_i^*|},$$

whenever $I \in \mathcal{K}_i$ and $\tau(I) \notin \mathcal{E}$;

$$(iv) \quad \sum |\tau(\mathcal{K}_i)^*| \leq |J| M \sup_i \llbracket \tau^{-1} \max \tau(\mathcal{K}_i) \rrbracket.$$

5 Examples

The properties $\mathcal{P}$ respectively weak- $\mathcal{P}$ are clearly very similar to – but more complicated than – condition $\mathcal{S}$. It might be asked whether one could use condition $\mathcal{S}$ to determine when a permutation induces a bounded operator and when not.

We describe now a rearrangement τ such that $\|T\| < \infty$ and τ does not satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$. This explains why we had to introduce the weak-Property $\mathcal{P}$ in Theorem 2. The construction of τ uses a permutation σ such that $\|S\| \|S^{-1}\| < \infty$ but the underlying rearrangement σ does not satisfy condition $\mathcal{S}$. Hence the more complicated Property $\mathcal{P}$ appears in Theorem 1.

In $[0, \frac{1}{4})$ choose pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals $K_1, \dots, K_n \dots$ and natural numbers $l_1, \dots, l_n \dots$ recursively so that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_1| &= \frac{1}{8}, \\ l_n &= |K_n|^{-1} 2^{-1}, \\ |K_{n+1}| &= |K_n|^2 2^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The collection $\mathcal{K}_n = \{J \subset K_n : \log_2 |K_n| \leq \log_2 |J| + l_n\}$ consists of $l_n + 1$ generations:

$$G_i(\mathcal{K}_n) = \{J \subset K_n : \log_2 |K_n| = \log_2 |J| + i\}, \quad i = 0, \dots, l_n.$$

$G_i(\mathcal{K}_n)$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals that covers K_n and

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{l_n} |G_i(\mathcal{K}_n)^*| = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We define ρ_n on $\mathcal{K}_n$ as

$$G_i(\mathcal{K}_n) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} + i|K_n| + G_i(\mathcal{K}_n),$$

i.e., when $I \in G_i(\mathcal{K}_n)$, then

$$\rho_n(I) = 1/2 + i|K_n| + I.$$

Notice that $\rho_n(G_i(\mathcal{K}_n))^*$ is disjoint from $\rho_n(G_j(\mathcal{K}_n))^*$ when $i \neq j$.

On $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup \mathcal{K}_n$ we define ρ by the relation $\rho(I) = \rho_n(I)$ iff $I \in \mathcal{K}_n$. Using the fact that $|\rho(I)| = |I|$, we can show that ρ extends from $\mathcal{K}$ to $\mathcal{D}$ injectively in such a way that the permutation operator R induced by ρ satisfies $\|R\| \leq 2$.

Notice that, by (5.1), $\rho(\mathcal{K}_n)^* = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Hence for $m \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{n=1}^m |\rho(\mathcal{K}_n)^*| = \frac{m}{2}.$$

Let $S_n \subset K_n$ be the dyadic interval with the same left endpoint as K_n such that

$$(5.3) \quad |S_n| |K_n|^{-1} = \epsilon_n \ll 1.$$

Let σ_n be the natural bijection acting between the collections $\{J \subseteq K_n : \log_2 |K_n| \leq \log_2 |J| + l_n\}$ and $\{J \subseteq S_n : \log_2 |S_n| \leq \log_2 |J| + l_n\}$. On $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup \mathcal{K}_n$ we define σ by $\sigma(I) = \sigma_n(I)$ iff $I \in \mathcal{K}_n$. Then $\tau = \rho \circ \sigma^{-1}$ can be extended to $\mathcal{D}$ so as to induce a bounded operator on BMO . However, by (5.2) and (5.3), τ does not satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$ when $\epsilon_n \downarrow 0$ decreases sufficiently fast. Moreover, σ and σ^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$ (hence $\|S\| \|S^{-1}\| < \infty$) but σ does not satisfy condition $\mathcal{S}$.

6 Transformation of Carleson measures in $\mathbf{D}$

In this section we apply Theorem 1 to study transformations h of the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$ which preserve the class of Carleson measures. The condition on h is

analogous to Property $\mathcal{P}$.

Let I be an interval – not necessarily dyadic – in $[0, 1)$. Then $S(I) := \{re^{2\pi i\theta} : \theta \in I, 1 - |I| \leq r\}$. A measure μ on $\mathcal{D}$ is called a Carleson measure if, $\|\mu\|_C = \sup_I \mu(S(I))/|I| < \infty$, where the supremum is taken over all intervals in $[0, 1)$. Given I , we consider $T(I) = \{re^{2\pi i\theta} : \theta \in I, 1 - |I| < r \leq 1 - |I|/2\}$. If I runs through all dyadic intervals in $[0, 1)$ then $\{T(I)\}$ forms a pairwise disjoint decomposition of $\mathcal{D}$.

A sequence $\{z_i\}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ is called M -separated if, for any dyadic interval I , $T(I)$ does not contain more than M elements of the sequence $\{z_i\}$. If $E = \{z_i\}$ is a 1-separated sequence, then there exists a uniquely determined collection $\mathcal{E} = \{I_i\}$ of dyadic intervals such that $z_i \in T(I_i)$. We let E^* be the radial projection of $\{T(I_i) : i \in \mathbf{N}\}$ onto the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$. Notice that E^* naturally corresponds to $\mathcal{E}^*$, the set covered by $\mathcal{E}$ in $[0, 1)$ if we identify $\mathbb{T} = \{e^{2\pi i\theta} : \theta \in [0, 1)\}$ with $[0, 1)$. We say that a transformation $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ satisfies Property $\mathcal{P}$ if there exists $M \geq 1$ such that every 1-separated sequence $\{z_i\}$ can be decomposed into $Y_1, \dots, Y_M$ so that $h\{Y_k\}$ is 1 separated and for every interval $J \subset [0, 1)$, the sequence $h\{Y_k\} \cap S(J)$ can be decomposed as

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} h\{L_i\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$$

so that the following conditions hold:

(i) For $E = \bigcup E_i$, the measure $\mu = \sum_{\omega \in E} (1 - |\omega|)\delta_{\omega}$ is a Carleson measure and $\|\mu\|_C \leq M$.

$$(ii) \quad \frac{1 - |h(z)|}{1 - |z|} \leq M \frac{|h\{L_i\}^*| + |E_i^*|}{|L_i^*|}$$

whenever $z \in L_i$ and $h(z) \notin E$.

$$(iii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |h\{L_i\}^*| \leq M|J|.$$

The following theorem characterises those transformations of the unit disc that preserve Carleson measures.

Theorem 3 *Let $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a bijection. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *There exists $M \geq 1$ so that for every measure μ on $\mathbb{D}$*

$$\frac{1}{M} \|\nu\|_C \leq \|\mu\|_C \leq M \|\nu\|_C$$

where the measure ν is defined by $\nu(A) = \mu(h^{-1}(A))$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{D}$

(ii) *h and h^{-1} satisfy Property $\mathcal{P}$.*

(iii) *There exists $M \geq 1$ so that for every sequence $\{z_i\}$ in $\mathbb{D}$*

$$\frac{1}{M} \|\nu\|_C \leq \|\mu\|_C \leq M \|\nu\|_C$$

where $\mu = \sum (1 - |z_i|) \delta_{z_i}$ and $\nu = \sum (1 - |h(z_i)|) \delta_{h(z_i)}$.

The rearrangements τ described in the previous sections can be used as a model for the transformations h appearing in Theorem 3. In fact, Theorem 1 solves a model problem for Theorem 3. Hence, when based on Lemma 2.1 in [J1] the proof of Theorem 3 is very similar to the proof of Theorem 1. In order to avoid repetition we leave the details to the reader.

References

- [F-St] C. Fefferman, E.M. Stein, H^p spaces of several variables, Acta Math. **129** (1972), 137-193.
- [J1] P.W. Jones, Carleson measures and the Fefferman-Stein decomposition of $BMO(\mathbb{R})$, Annals Math. **111** (1980), 197-208.
- [J2] P.W. Jones, BMO and the Banach space approximation problem, Amer. J. Math. **107** (1985), 853-893.
- [J3] P.W. Jones, Homeomorphisms of the real line which preserve BMO , Ark. f. Mat. **21** (1983), 229-231.
- [S1] E. Semyonov, On the equivalence in $\mathcal{L}_p$ of rearrangements of the Haar system, Soviet Math. Dokl. **19** (1978), 1292-1294.
- [S2] E. Semyonov, B. Stöckert, Haar system rearrangement in the spaces $\mathcal{L}_p$, Analysis Math. **7** (1981), 277-298.
- [S3] E. Semyonov, On the boundedness of operators rearranging the Haar system in the space $\mathcal{L}_p$, Int. Eq. Op. Th. **6** (1983), 385-404.

Current address:

Yale University, 06520 New Haven, CT

e-mail: muller@math.yale.edu